Claim 1 recites a part positioning method in which a part supported by a self-traveling machine is positioned with respect to a part fitting object, including the steps of: setting on the part fitting object an engaging means provided on a tip end of a wire member which is possible to be pulled out and wound up; detecting a pulled-out length and an existing location of the wire member and moving the self-traveling machine to eliminate relative positional discrepancies between the part fitting object and the part; fitting the part to the part fitting object in the state that the positional discrepancies are eliminated; and after fitting the part to the part fitting object, removing and retrieving the engaging means from the part fitting object.

Claim 2 recites a part positioning apparatus for positioning a part supported by a self-traveling machine with respect to a part fitting object, including an engaging means being provided on a tip end of a wire member so as to be set on the part fitting object; a sensed member for accommodating the wire member in such a state as to be pulled out and wound up; a first sensor for detecting a pulled-out length of the wire member when the engaging means is set on the part fitting object; a second sensor for detecting an existing location of the wire member when the engaging means is set on the part fitting object; and a controller means for controlling a traveling amount of the self-traveling machine such that each of detection values of the first sensor and the second sensor is in agreement with a reference value.

Applicants respectfully note Yoshihiro is the reference discussed in the Background Art section on the first page of the instant patent application and was cited in an Information Disclosure Statement filed with the application on August 11, 2006.

Yoshihiro teaches a part assembling device having a table positioning device (37) that positions a movable table (50) holding a part (22) thereon and that is to be assembled onto a work (21). A table elevator (36) raises the table (50) and part (22), and after the table (50) is appropriately positioned, the part (22) is held at a predetermined position beneath the work (21). As such, Yoshihiro teaches a part (22) that can be positioned on the work (21), and the part assembling device (70) assembles the part (22) onto the work (21).

In item 3 of the Office Action, a list of features that are not recited by Claims 1 and 2 are provided as an explanation of what is taught by Yoshihiro. Applicants note ***none*** of the features identified in item 3 are recited by Claims 1 and 2.

Furthermore, Applicants note that in item 4, the Office Action admits Yoshihiro fails to teach ***any*** of the features recited by Claims 1 and 2.

With respect to the Firstmark publication, Applicants respectfully submit the publication is directed primarily to a control system for use in the airline industry, although there is a brief passage describing how an automotive company used a single displacement sensor during manufacture and assembly of motor vehicles. A review of the Firstmark publication fails to uncover any teaching or suggestion that the Firstmark system includes any of the features recited by Claims 1 and 2.

That is, Applicants are unable to determine where the Firstmark publication teaches *any* of the features recited by Claims 1 and 2, as asserted by the Office Action in justifying the claim rejection. Rather, it appears as if the Office Action basis the rejection on conclusions that do not appear to be supported by the Firstmark publication.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 2 and assert Yoshihiro fails to teach or suggest ***any*** of the features recited by Claims 1 and 2, as admitted by the Office Action, and that the Firstmark publication fails to teach or suggest ***any*** of the features recited by Claims 1 and 2.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 2 are not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Yoshihiro and the Firstmark publication, either alone or in combination, as combining the teachings of the two references would never arrive at the invention recited by Claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the Office Action has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness as required under M.P.E.P. §2143.03. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 1 and 2 are allowable for the above-described reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, allowance of Claims 1 and 2, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing attorney docket number 028359-00004**.

Respectfully submitted,

Murat Ozgu
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time